



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,160	08/16/2001	Alexandre Kravtchenko	80168-0240	1489
32658	7590	04/18/2006	EXAMINER	
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500 1200 SEVENTEEN ST. DENVER, CO 80202			CAO, DIEM K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/930,160

Applicant(s)

KRAVTCHENKO ET AL.

Examiner

Diem K. Cao

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,7,9-13,15-18 and 21-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,7,9-13,15-18 and 21-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9-13, 15-18 and 21-34 are pending. Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, and canceled claims 5 and 35.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9-13, 15-18 and 21-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wess, Jr. (U.S. 6,163,781) in view of McGauley et al. (U.S. 5,899,998) further in view of Sprenger et al. (U.S. 6,363,388 B1).**

4. As to claim 1, Wess teaches
 - selecting a file on a local drive or by URL, wherein the file includes a name of an object (permitting human users to send and receive data, and to control various operations of the processing system; col. 6, lines 11-14, Network interface converts the format of data and commands ... textually-based data objects; col. 6, lines 16-29 and lines 53-57, col. 13, lines 3-10, Fig. 7 and associated text),
 - uploading the file including the name of the object to a server (data and command from the remote system 116 ... processing system 115; col. 6, lines 16-29 and Fig. 7),

Art Unit: 2194

- storing data of the file in a storage of the utility (When a data object instance ... by the functional components 106 and 108; col. 7, lines 38-44),
- downloading and saving a report to the user after the data processing is completed (returning the actual values ... in the remote computer system 116; col. 8, line 60 – col. 9, line 13),

5. However, Wess does not teach starting a session, a business object, delivering the data to the business object corresponding to the name uploaded to the server, with the business object, performing a task on the delivered data, the task performing including invoking a code included in the business object. McGauley teaches starting a session (The laboratory's POS ... designated database; col. 14, lines 14-34), a business object (update objects 240; col. 8, line 60 – col. 9, line 21), delivering the data to the business object corresponding to the name uploaded to the server (the data model ... tags attached; col. 11, lines 60-62), with the business object, performing a task on the delivered data (The update type ... new record object; col. 9, lines 46-52), the task performing including invoking a code included in the business object (the update object ... audit fields 247; col. 9, lines 14-21), the task comprises adding, deleting or updating of the data delivered to the business object (col. 9, lines 45-52). Sprenger teaches the code includes an interface to support an export generation (col. 5, lines 45-50 and col. 18, lines 44-45).

6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Wess, McGauley and Sprenger because it provides a method of exporting and importing of data in object-relation databases using business objects,

Art Unit: 2194

and a method to manage data in the database using objects and can support a wide variety of hardware configurations, and easily scale up to meet added demands from the users.

7. As to claim 3, Wess does not teach the code includes doImport/Export. However, Wess teaches import and export functionalities are provided in the system (col. 12, lines 16-32).

McGauley teaches objects provide import/export functionalities (title and col. 9, lines 45-52).

8. As to claim 4, Wess does not teach the doImport/Export is a command to perform an operation. McGauley teaches objects provide import/export functionalities (title and col. 9, lines 45-52), and objects include commands to perform operations (col. 9, lines 45-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Wess and McGauley to include the doImport/Export command in the object that carries out the import/export functionalities

9. As to claim 6, Wess as modified teaches the interface includes a code for throwing an attribute set returned by the business object (col. 8, line 60 – col. 9, line 13).

10. As to claim 7, Wess teaches the utility is designed to process the file on the remote server (col. 6, lines 25-29).

11. As to claim 9, Wess does not teach the session is for import and export operations. Sprenger teaches the session is for import and export operation (col. 5, lines 45-50).

12. As to claim 10, Wess does not teach the starting of a session includes generating a unique session ID. Sprenger teaches the starting of a session includes generating a unique session ID (col. 14, lines 34-39 and col. 19, lines 35-45).

13. As to claim 11, Wess teaches the database of the utility includes a plurality of tables (col. 9, lines 55-57).

14. As to claim 12, Wess does not explicitly each the plurality of tables include a user name and session ID storing table, a session status storing table, an initial session data storing table, a result storing table, an error message storing table, and a session log storing table. Sprenger teaches the plurality of tables include a user name and session ID storing table, a session status storing table, an initial session data storing table, a result storing table, an error message storing table, and a session log storing table (col. 4, lines 30-39, col. 14, lines 34-39, col. 14, lines 59-65, col. 17, lines 53-67, col. 18, lines 30-38, and col. 18, line 65 – col. 19, line 4).

15. As to claim 13, Wess does not teach the business object includes a code including a command that provides instance of the business object with an attribute. Sprenger teaches the business object includes a code including a command which provides instance of the business object with an attribute (col. 15, lines 25-26).

16. As to claim 15, Wess as modified does not teach the business object includes a `findByAttributes`. Wess teaches the query/retrieve functionality based on the search criteria such as column name of the table that provided by the file uploaded from the remote computer (col. 12, lines 16-32). Sprenger teaches objects provide import/export functionalities (col. 5, lines 45-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art adding any type of commands/functions to the object is just a choice of implementation.

17. As to claim 16, Wess and Sprenger do not teach the `findByAttributes` supports object references in the file. However, Wess teaches sub-query is supported (col. 12, lines 26-32), and object reference is widely used in object and object-oriented programming language. It would have been obvious object reference is utilized in the system of Wess as modified by Sprenger.

18. As to claim 17, Wess as modified teaches the business object includes a code that receives a list of validated object attributes and returns a unique object identifier (col. 9, line 50 – col. 10, line 36).

19. As to claim 18, Wess as modified teaches the business object includes a code for notifying an end of the data processing (col. 17, lines 5-10).

20. As to claim 21, Wess teaches the file is a text file including command lines, header lines, and data (col. 6, lines 25-28 and col. 6, line 59 – col. 7, line 37).

21. As to claim 22, Wess does not teach the session is an export operation. Sprenger teaches the session is an export operation (col. 5, lines 45-50).

22. As to claim 23, Wess as modified teaches the business object exports all of its data or part of the data (col. 12, lines 16-32).

23. As to claim 24, Wess does not teach the business object calls an interface including a plurality of codes. Sprenger teaches the business object calls an interface including a plurality of codes (col. 7, lines 2-9).

24. As to claim 25, Wess does not teach the plurality of codes include a first code including a name of operation and a business object class name to be inserted into an output file. Sprenger teaches the plurality of codes include a first code including a name of operation and a business object class name to be inserted into an output file (col. 7, lines 2-9 and col. 29, lines 50-51).

25. As to claim 26, Wess as modified does not teach the plurality of codes include onReceiveExport. Wess teaches the query/retrieve functionality based on the search criteria such as column name of the table that provided by the file uploaded from the remote computer (col. 12, lines 16-32). Sprenger teaches objects provide import/export functionalities (col. 5, lines 45-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art adding any type of commands/functions to the object is just a choice of implementation.

26. As to claim 27, Wess as modified does not teach the onReceiveExport is a code for throwing an attribute set returned by the business object. However, Sprenger teaches an object for carry out the import/export functionality (col. 5, lines 45-50). It would have been obvious the object provides a method to return the result set to the user after finish processing the function.

27. As to claim 28, Wess teaches the utility is a deliverer of information (col. 12, lines 16-32).

28. As to claim 29, Wess does not teach the data is changed without changing the business object. Sprenger teaches the data is changed without changing the business object (col. 16, lines 25-32).

29. As to claim 30, Wess teaches the utility includes a monitoring function, an error handling function, and reporting function (col. 8, line 43 – col. 9, line 13).

30. As to claim 31, Wess teaches the utility receives information from another system (col. 6, lines 16-29). However, Wess does not teach load information to the business object. McGauley teaches the load information to the business object (col. 8, line 62-64 and col. 9, lines 45-52).

31. As to claim 32, Wess does not teach the utility receives information from the business object and stores information on another system. McGauley teaches the utility receives

Art Unit: 2194

information from the business object and stores information on another system (col. 4, lines 37-48).

32. As to claim 33, see rejection of claim 1 above. McGauley further teach import and export data to the network application (title and abstract), and updating the data in the utility database based on the performance of the operation by the invoked business object (col. 9, lines 42-45).

33. As to claim 34, Wess as modified teaches performing validation with the business object (col. 8, lines 46-60).

Response to Arguments

34. Applicant's arguments filed 1/30/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that (1) Wess fails to teach selecting a file that has a business object name in the file, and the “data objects” are not the same as the business objects as defined by Applicants, (2) McGauley fails to teach or suggest the data delivering step because the object is already carry the data with it, the performing a task on the delivered data with the business object step, and file selecting step, and (3) Sprenger fails teach or suggest “performing an operation with a business object named in an import file on data uploaded to a database by a utility”.

Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's arguments:

- As to the point (1), Wess teaches a file that has an object name in the file (see the Fig. 7 and associated text). In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the data object is not the same as the business object as defined by the Applicant) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
- As to the point (2), McGauley teaches the record object and the update object are constructed, thus, McGauley teaches the data is delivered to the business object (the record object is embedded in the update object). McGauley further teaches the type of action is needed to carry out (col. 9, lines 46-52), i.e., invoke the code in the business object. As to the file selecting step, it is taught by Wess, not McGauley (see rejection of claim 1).
- As to the point (3), Sprenger's reference is used to teach the code includes an interface to support an export generation, not "performing an operation with a business object named in an import file on data uploaded to a database by a utility". Thus, the arguments are not persuasive.

Conclusion

35. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K. Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3760. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 5:30AM - 2:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thompson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents

Application/Control Number: 09/930,160


Page 12

Art Unit: 2194

PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist at 571-272-2100.

Diem Cao



WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER